arXiv:1510.01349v2 [math.CO] 1 Nov 2015

THE PARAMETRIC FROBENIUS PROBLEM AND PARAMETRIC EXCLUSION

Bobby Shen[1]

Abstract. The Frobenius number of relatively prime positive integers $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is the largest integer that is not a nononegative integer combination of the a_i. Given positive integers $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ with $n \geq 2$, the set of multiples of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ which have less than m distinct representations as a nonnegative integer combination of the a_i is bounded above, so we define $f_{m,\ell}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ to be the ℓ^{th} largest multiple of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ with less than m distinct representations (which generalizes the Frobenius number) and $g_m(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ to be the number of positive multiples of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ with less than m distinct representations. In the parametric Frobenius problem, the arguments are polynomials. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ be integer valued polynomials of one variable which are eventually positive. We prove that $f_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ and $g_m(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$, as functions of t, are eventually quasi-polynomial. A function h is eventually quasi-polynomial if there exist d and polynomials $R_0, \ldots, R_{d-1}$ such that for such that for sufficiently large integers t, $h(t) = R_{t \pmod d}(t)$. We do so by formulating a type of parametric problem that generalizes the parametric Frobenius Problem, which we call a parametric exclusion problem. We prove that the ℓ^{th} largest value of some polynomial objective function, with multiplicity, for a parametric exclusion problem and the size of its feasible set are eventually quasi-polynomial functions of t.

1. Introduction

1.1. **The Parametric Frobenius Problem.** Let $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be positive integers with greatest common divisor 1. The *Frobenius number* $F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is the largest integer that is not of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i a_i$ for nonnegative integers $b_1, \ldots, b_n$. A related quantity is the number of positive integers which are not of this form, which we denote by $G(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. Determining $F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. is known as the *Frobenius Problem*, which has been well studied. In 1884, Sylvester proved that $F(a, b) = ab - a - b$[7]. It is known that $G(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}(a-1)(b-1)$. Ramírez Alfonsín's book is a broad survey of known results[3].

We also define these quantities for general positive integers $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Define $F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ to be the largest multiple of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ which is not a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ linear combination of $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, and define $G(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ to be the number of positive multiples of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ which are not $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ linear combinations. It is easy to check that for positive integers $c, a_1, \ldots, a_n$, $F(ca_1, \ldots, ca_n) = cF(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, and $G(ca_1, \ldots, ca_n) = G(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.

The *parametric Frobenius problem*, as defined by Roune and Woods[5], is to determine, given functions $P_1, \ldots, P_n : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, $F(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ as a function of the integer parameter t. In this paper, t is always a positive integer. For example, using Sylvester's result, for all integers $t > 2$,

$$F(t, t-2) = \begin{cases} t(t-2) - t - (t-2) & t \equiv 1 \pmod 2 \\ 2\left(\frac{t}{2}\frac{t-2}{2} - \frac{t}{2} - \frac{t-2}{2}\right) & t \equiv 0 \pmod 2. \end{cases}$$

The two pieces are not the same polynomial. Rather, $F(t, t+2)$ is eventually quasi-polynomial.

[1]Bobby Shen, Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, runbobby@mit.edu

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classsifications*: 05A16, 11D07, 90C10, 90C31

Keywords: Frobenius problem, integer programming, parametric integer linear programming, quasi-polynomials

Definition 1.1. f is *eventually quasi-polynomial* (EQP) if its domain is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ that contains sufficiently large integers and there exists a positive integer d and polynomials $R_0, \ldots, R_{d-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}[u]$ such that for sufficiently large t, $f(t) = R_{t \pmod d}(t)$.

We say that d is a period of f if polynomials $R_0, \ldots, R_{d-1}$ exist as above, and we call $R_0, \ldots, R_{d-1}$ the components. Similarly, one can show that $G(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ is eventually quasi-polynomial in this example. We define functions which generalize the Frobenius problem using the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2. *Let n be a positive integer at least 2 and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be relatively prime positive integers. For integers k, define $h(k)$ to be the number of nonnegative integer n-tuples $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ such that $k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i a_i$. Then $\lim_{k\to\infty} h(k) = \infty$.*

Proof. Let N be a positive integer. For all integers k greater than $Na_1a_2 + F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, $k - Na_1a_2 > F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, so there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $k - Na_1a_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i a_i$. Since $n \geq 2$, for all integers q with $0 \leq q \leq N$,

$$k = \left(\sum_{i=3}^{n} c_i a_i\right) + (c_1 + qa_2)a_1 + (c_2 + (N-q)a_1)a_2.$$

All coefficients for all values of ℓ are nonnegative integers, which gives us $N+1$ distinct representations, which shows that $h(k)$ goes to infinity. □

Definition 1.3. Let $n, m, \ell, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be positive integers, where $n \geq 2$.

$F_{m,\ell}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is the ℓ^{th} largest integer in the set $\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \gcd(a-1, \ldots, a_n) \mid h(k) < m\}$, where $h(k)$ is as above.

$G_m(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is the number of positive multiples of $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ k such that $h(k) < m$.

These numbers exist by above Proposition 1.2. These new functions are more general than the usual functions for the Frobenius problem:

$$F_{1,1}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = F(a_1, \ldots, a_n). \quad G_1(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = G(a_1, \ldots, a_n).$$

As before, for positive integers $c, a_1, \ldots, a_n$, we have $F_{m,\ell}(ca_1, \ldots, ca_n) = cF_{m,\ell}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $G_m(ca_1, \ldots, ca_n) = G_m(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$.

Again, one can consider the case when the argumentss are polynomials of t. In order for the functions to be defined for sufficiently large t, we should have polynomials $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ that map $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and have positive leading coefficient. In 2015, Roune and Woods conjectured the following for such polynomials[5].

Conjecture 1.4. *$P_1, \ldots, P_n$ be in $\mathbb{R}[u]$ which map $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and have positive leading coefficient. For all t such that $P_i(t) > 0$ for all i, let $D(t) = F(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$. Then D is EQP.*

Roune and Woods conjectured that for such polynomials, $F(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ is EQP. They actually conjectured this result when $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ are EQP, map $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and are eventually positive. Since n is finite, it's easy to see that this broader case reduces to the case of polynomials. They proved the conjecture for the case $n \leq 3$ and the case when all polynomials have degree at most 1 and proved certain results about the period of the resulting EQP and its degree (or the maximum degree of the components). In this paper, we do not address the degree or period of the EQPs. Otherwise, we prove a far more general result about the parametric Frobenius problem.

Theorem 1.5. *Let n, m, and ℓ be positive integers with $n \geq 2$ and $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ be polynomials that map $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and have positive leading coefficient.*

Let $D(t) = F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ and $E(t) = G_m(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ for all integers t such that $P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)$ are positive; this holds for sufficiently large t. Then D and E are EQP.

As noted by Roune and Woods, when $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ are polynomials of two integer parameters, $F(P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ is a function of two parameters which is generally not considered eventually quasi-polynomial. For example, $F(s,t) = \operatorname{lcm}(s,t) - s - t$ is not considered quasi-polynomial; it lacks a periodic structure as (s,t) ranges over the integer lattice.

1.2. **Parametric Integer Linear Programming.** The parametric Frobenius problem has a particular parametric structure that motivates us to examine a more general parametric problem. In this section, we introduce parametric integer linear programs and another type of parametric problem. The latter type is a generalization of the parametric Frobenius problem, and we show that related functions are eventually quasi-polynomial.

An integer program is the optimization of a certain objective function over the integers subject to certain constraints. Often in integer programming, the constraints and objective functions are linear functions of the indeterminates. This is known as integer linear programming.

Suppose that the indeterminates are $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. A program is in canonical form if the objective function is $\mathbf{c}^\intercal \mathbf{x}$ for $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and the constraints are $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all i and $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ for $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. (In this paper, relations between vectors are coordinate-wise.)

Parametric Integer Linear Programming refers to considering a family of linear integer programs parametrized by a variable t i.e. the coefficients of the objective and/or constraints are functions of t. The optimum value of the objective function is a function of t, (which we call the optimum value function) which leads us to questions about this function. Examples for the domain of t are the interval $[0,1]$ or the positive integers. There are many algorithmic results on parametric integer linear programs (PILP) but few theoretical results the properties of the optimum value function or other properties of a PILP.

A type of PILP relevant to the parametric Frobenius problem is the case when all coefficients are integer polynomials of t and t is an integer parameter.

We use two known results about such PILPs. The following is Theorem 2.1 by Chen, Li, and Sam[1].

Theorem 1.6. *Let n and m be positive integers. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^n$, A be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{m \times n}$, and $\mathbf{b}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^m$*

For all t, let

$$R(t) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid A(t)\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}(t)\},$$

the set of real vectors that satisfy a certain conjunction of inequalities. Let $L(t)$ be the set of lattice points in $R(t)$. Assume that $R(t)$ is bounded for all t. Let $g(t) = |L(t)|$. Then g is eventually quasi-polynomial.

A critical tool used in the proof of this theorem is base t representations, which reduces the theorem to the case of A in $\mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$. Shen used the same idea to prove the following result, as Corollary 3.2.2:

Theorem 1.7 (Shen[6])**.** *Let n and m be positive integers. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^n$, A be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{m \times n}$, and $\mathbf{b}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^m$*

For all t, let

$$R(t) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid A(t)\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}(t)\},$$

the set of real vectors that satisfy a certain conjunction of inequalities. Let $L(t)$ be the set of lattice points in $R(t)$. Assume that $R(t)$ is bounded for all t. For all positive integers ℓ, Let $f_\ell(t)$ be the ℓ^{th} largest value of $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{x}$ with multiplicity for $\mathbf{x}$ in $L(t)$ or $-\infty$ if $|L(t)| < \ell$. Then for all ℓ, f_ℓ is eventually quasi-polynomial.

The constant function at $-\infty$ is to be interpreted as a polynomial. By ℓ^{th} largest value with multiplicity, we mean the ℓ^{th} largest value in the multiset formed by evaluating the objective function on the set $L(t)$.

An derivative of PILPs that is the focus of this paper involves excluding the projection of one parametric linearly defined set of integers from another parametric linearly defined set. We call this a parametric exclusion problem

Theorem 1.8 (Main Theorem)**.** *Let m, n_1, n_2, p_1, p_2 be positive integers. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{n_2}$, A_1 be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_1\times(n_1+n_2)}$, A_2 be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_2\times n_2}$, $\mathbf{b_1}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_1}$, and $\mathbf{b_2}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_2}$. Let the indeterminates be $x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2}$. Let $\mathbf{x_1} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2}), \mathbf{x_2} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n_2})$, and $\mathbf{x_3} = (x_{n_2+1}, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2})$.*

For all t, let

$$R_1(t) := \{\mathbf{x_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} \mid \mathbf{x_1} \geq \mathbf{0} \wedge A_1(t)\mathbf{x_1} = \mathbf{b_1}(t)\}$$

and

$$R_2(t) := \{\mathbf{x_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \mid \mathbf{x_2} \geq \mathbf{0} \wedge A_2(t)\mathbf{x_2} \leq \mathbf{b_2}(t)\}.$$

Assume that $R_1(t)$ and $R_2(t)$ are bounded for all t. Let $L_1(t) := R_1(t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n_1+n_2}, L_2(t) := R_2(t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n_2}$, the set of lattice points in $R_1(t)$ and $R_2(t)$, respectively.

Let

$$L_3(t) := \left\{\mathbf{x_2} \in L_2(t) \mid \#\left\{\mathbf{x_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \mid (\mathbf{x_2} \oplus \mathbf{x_3}) \in L_1'(t)\right\} < m\right\},$$

or the set of $\mathbf{x_2}$ in $L_2(t)$ which is the image of less than m points when projecting $L_1(t)$ onto $\mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ (using the last n_2 coordinates).

For all (positive integers) t and ℓ, let $f_\ell(t)$ be $-\infty$ if $|L_3(t)| < \ell$ or the ℓ^{th} largest value with multiplicity of $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{x_2}$ for $\mathbf{x_2}$ in $L_3(t)$ otherwise, and let $g(t)$ be $|L_3(t)|$. Then for all ℓ, f_ℓ and g are eventually quasi-polynomial.

In this paper, $\mathbf{v_1} \oplus \mathbf{v_2}$ means the vector which has the coordinates of $\mathbf{v_1}$ first then those of $\mathbf{v_2}$.

As is the case for PILPs, one could formulate different versions of Theorem 1.8 by switching to $A_1(t)\mathbf{x_1} = \mathbf{b_1}(t)$ and/or $A_2(t)\mathbf{x_2} \leq \mathbf{b_2}(t)$, but we do not do so here. We say that the parametric exclusion problem shown in 1.8 is given by positive integers m, n_1, n_2, etc. We call $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{x_2}$ the objective function, $\{f_\ell\}_\ell$ or $\{f_\ell\}$ the family of optimum value functions and g the size function.

Later, we show that Theorem 1.5 follows easily from the above theorem.

1.3. **Notation and Terminology.** In this paper, relations between vectors are coordinate-wise. The variables t, ℓ, and m are always positive integers. The phrase $t \gg 0$ means "for sufficiently large t." The constant function at $-\infty$ is to be interpreted as a polynomial. PILP means "parametric integer linear program." EQP means "eventually quasi-polynomial" or "eventual quasi-polynomial." See Definition 1.1 for the meaning of the period and components of an EQP. By the ℓ^{th} largest value, we mean the ℓ^{th} largest value with multiplicity. The symbol $\vee$ denotes logical disjunction, $\wedge$ denotes logical conjunction, and either may be used as a binary operator or with an indexing set. The cardinality of a set S is denoted by $\#S$.

When we refer to elements of $\mathbb{R}^m$ or an expression like $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$, we mean a (column) vector, especially in matrix operations. In general, $\mathbf{x_1}$ denotes the vector $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2}), \mathbf{x_2} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n_2})$, and $\mathbf{x_3} = (x_{n_2+1}, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2})$, and the same is true for other letters. The symbol $\oplus$ as in $\mathbf{v_1} \oplus \mathbf{v_2}$ means concatenation of vectors.

A parametric inequality specifically has the form $\mathbf{a}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{z} \leq b(t)$, where $\mathbf{a}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[u]$-vector of the correct dimension, b is in $\mathbb{Z}[u]$, and $\mathbf{z}$ refers to a vector of *integer* indeterminates e.g. $\mathbf{x_1}$. A parametric equation is the same with equality instead of "$\leq$."

We say that the parametric exclusion problem shown in 1.8 is given by positive integers m, n_1, n_2, etc. We call $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{x_2}$ the objective function, $\{f_\ell\}_\ell$ or $\{f_\ell\}$ the family of optimum value functions and g the size function.

2. Base t Representations

In this section, we formulate a weaker version of Theorem 1.8 and show that it implies Theorem 1.8. We prove this new theorem in the next two sections. This theorem is based on the idea of expressing the indeterminates in base t. Despite its appearance, it is much more tractable than Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 2.1. *Let m, n_1, n_2, p, q be positive integers. Let $\mathbf{c}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{n_2}$, A_1 be in $\mathbb{Z}^{q\times(n_1+n_2)}$ (not $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{q\times(n_1+n_2)}$), A_2 be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p\times n_2}$, $\mathbf{b_2}$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^p$, $\mathfrak{S}$ be a finite set, and $\mathbf{b}(\alpha)$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^q$ for all α in $\mathfrak{S}$.*

Let the indeterminates be $y_1, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2}$. Let $\mathbf{y_1} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2}), \mathbf{y_2} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n_2})$, and $\mathbf{y_3} = (y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2})$.

For all t, let

$$R_2(t) := \{\mathbf{y_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \mid A_2(t)\mathbf{y_2} \leq \mathbf{b_2}(t)\}.$$

For all t and α in $\mathfrak{S}$, let

$$K(\alpha, t) := \{\mathbf{y_1} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1+n_2} \mid A_1\mathbf{y_1} = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)\}.$$

Assume, for all t, that $R_2(t)$ is a subset of $[0, t-1]^{n_2}$ and the sets $K(\alpha, t)$ for α in $\mathfrak{S}$ are disjoint. Let $L_2(t)$ be the set of lattice points in $R_2(t)$.

Let

$$L_3(t) := \{\mathbf{y_2} \in L_2(t) \mid \#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in \sqcup_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{S}} K(\alpha, t)\} < m\},$$

For all t and ℓ, let $f_\ell(t)$ be $-\infty$ if $|L_3(t)| < \ell$ or the ℓ^{th} largest value of $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{y_2}$ for $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $L_3(t)$ otherwise, and let $g(t)$ be $|L_3(t)|$. Then for all ℓ, f_ℓ and g are eventually quasi-polynomial.

The idea is that excluding the projection of sets like $K(\alpha, t)$ is much simpler to understand when the matrix has constant entries.

Proposition 2.2. *Theorem 2.1 implies Theorem 1.8*

To prove this proposition, we use Proposition 3.2 by Shen[6].

Proposition 2.3. *Consider a PILP given by a conjunction of parametric inequalities whose real vector set is bounded. Let its lattice point set be $L(t)$. Then there exists a positive integer r such that for $t \gg 0$, $\mathbf{x}$ in $L(t)$ and all i, $0 \leq x_i < t^r$.*

Before we prove Proposition 2.2, we construct several correspondences between certain lattice point sets and prove that they are bijections.

Consider a parametric exclusion problem given, as in Theorem 1.8, by positive integers m, n_1, n_2, p_1, p_2, $\mathbf{c}$ in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{n_2}$, A_1 in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_1\times(n_1+n_2)}$, A_2 in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_2\times n_2}$, $\mathbf{b_1}$ in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_1}$, and $\mathbf{b_2}$ in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^{p_2}$. Let its optimum value functions be $\{f_l\}$ and its size function be g.

Proposition 2.3 applies to $L_1(t)$ and $L_2(t)$. It tells us that there exists an integer r such that for $t \gg 0$, $\mathbf{x_1}$ in $L_1(t)$ or $\mathbf{x_2}$ in $L_2(t)$ and all appropriate i, $0 \leq x_i < t^r$.

We now construct another parametric exclusion problem, Q'. Let $m' = m, n_1' = rn_1, n_2' = rn_2$. Let the indeterminates be $y_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2,r}$. Let $\mathbf{y_1} = (y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2,r})$, $\mathbf{y_2} = (y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}, \ldots, y_{n_2,r})$, and $\mathbf{y_3} = (y_{n_2+1,1}, y_{n_2+1,2}, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2,r})$.

Let the objective function be $\sum_{i=1}^{n_2} c_i(t) \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{i,j} t^{j-1}$, which can be written as a polynomial covector times $\mathbf{y_2}$.

For all t, let

$$R_1'(t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r(n_1+n_2)} \mid 0 \le y_{i,j} \le t-1 \wedge A_1(t) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{1,j} t^{j-1}, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{n_1+n_2,j} t^{j-1} \right) \le \mathbf{b_1}(t) \right\},$$

$$R_2'(t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{rn_2} \mid 0 \le y_{i,j} \le t-1 \wedge A_2(t) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{1,j} t^{j-1}, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{n_2,j} t^{j-1} \right) = \mathbf{b_2}(t) \right\}.$$

Observe that both sets of constraints can be written in terms of parametric inequalities in $\mathbf{y_1}$ and $\mathbf{y_2}$, respectively, which can then be written in matrix form: $A_1'(t)\mathbf{y_2} \le \mathbf{b_1'}(t)$. However, it is convenient to not do so explicitly. Let $L_1'(t)$ and $L_2'(t)$ be the set of lattice points in $R_1'(t)$ and $R_2'(t)$, respectively.

Let

$$L_3'(t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_2} \in L_2'(t) \mid \#\left\{ \mathbf{y_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn_1} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in L_1'(t) \right\} < m \right\}.$$

Let $\{f_\ell'\}$ be the optimum value functions and g' be the size function.

Let $\varphi_{1,t}$ be the map from $\mathbb{Z}^{r(n_1+n_2)}$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{n_1+n_2}$ given by

$$\varphi_{1,t}(\mathbf{y_1}) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{1,j} t^{j-1}, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{n_1+n_2,j} t^{j-1} \right).$$

Define $\varphi_{2,t}$ from $\mathbb{Z}^{rn_2}$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}$ and $\varphi_{3,t}$ from $\mathbb{Z}^{rn_1}$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}$ similarly.

Proposition 2.4. *For $t > N$, $\varphi_{1,t}$ is a bijection from $L_1'(t)$ to $L_1(t)$.*

Proof. By construction, $\varphi_{1,t}$ maps $L_1'(t)$ into $L_1(t)$. It is injective because $L_1'(t)$ is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{r(n_1+n_2)}$ for all t. By the definition of r, for $t > N$, $\mathbf{x_1}$ in $L_1(t)$, and $0 \le x_1, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2} < t^r$. Therefore, for $1 \le i \le n_1 + n_2$, there exist unique $y_{i,1}, \ldots, y_{i,r}$ in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}$ such that $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{i,j} t^{j-1}$. Then $\mathbf{y_1} = (y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2,r})$ lies in $L_1'(t)$. This shows that $\varphi_{1,t}$ maps $L_1'(t)$ onto $L_1(t)$, as desired. □

Proposition 2.5. *For $t > N$, $\varphi_{2,t}$ is a bijection from $L_2'(t)$ to $L_2(t)$.*

The proof is similar.

Proposition 2.6. *For $t > N$ and $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_2}$, $\varphi_{3,t}$ is a bijection from*

$$\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn_1} \mid \mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3} \in L_1'(t)\} \text{ to } \{\mathbf{x_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \mid \varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \mathbf{x_3} \in L_1(t)\}.$$

Proof. Fix $t > N$. Since $L_1'(t)$ is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_2}$, the former set is also a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_1}$, and $\varphi_{3,t}$ maps the former set to its image injectively.

If $\mathbf{y_3}$ is in the former set, then $\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}$ is in $L_1'(t)$, $\varphi_{1,t}(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \varphi_{3,t}(\mathbf{y_3})$ is in $L_1(t)$ (by Proposition 2.4), and $\varphi_{3,t}(\mathbf{y_3})$ is in the latter set.

If $\mathbf{x_3}$ is in the latter set, then $\varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \mathbf{x_3}$ is in $L_1(t)$. By the definition of r, $0 \le x_{n_2+1}, \ldots, x_{n_1+n_2} < t^r$. Therefore, there exists $\mathbf{y_3}$ in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_1}$ such that $\varphi_{3,t}(\mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{x_3}$. Then $\varphi_{2,y}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \varphi_{3,t}(\mathbf{y_3}) = \varphi_{1,t}(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3})$ is in $L_1(t)$, $\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}$ is in $L_1'(t)$ (by Proposition 2.4), and $\mathbf{y_3}$ is in the former set, as desired. □

Proposition 2.7. *For $t > N$, $\varphi_{2,t}$ is a bijection from $L_3'(t)$ to $L_3(t)$.*

Proof. Fix $t > N$. $L_3'(t)$ is a subset of $L_2'(t)$, which is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_2}$, so $\varphi_{2,t}$ maps injectively from $L_3'(t)$.

If $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $L_3'(t)$, then $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $L_2'(t)$ and $\#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn_1} \mid \mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3} \in L_1'(t)\} < m$. By Propositions 2.5 and 2.6, $\varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2})$ is in $L_2(t)$, and $\#\{\mathbf{x_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \mid \varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \mathbf{x_3} \in L_1(t)\} < m$, so $\varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2})$ is in $L_3(t)$.

If $\mathbf{x_2}$ is in $L_3(t)$, then it is in $L_2(t)$ too, and $0 \le x_1, \ldots, x_{n_2} < t^r$. Therefore, there exists $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{rn_2}$ such that $\varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) = \mathbf{x_2}$. By Proposition 2.5, $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $L_2'(t)$. Also from the definition of $L_3(t)$, $\#\{\mathbf{x_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \mid \varphi_{2,t}(\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus \mathbf{x_3} \in L_1(t)\} < m$, so by Proposition 2.6,
$\#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \mathbb{Z}^{rn_1} \mid \mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3} \in L_1'(t)\} < m$, so $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $L_3'(t)$, as desired. □

As first shown by Chen, Li, and Sam in [1], there exist a finite number of much simpler lattice point sets whose union is $L_1'(t)$ for $t \gg 0$. Lemma 3.3 of [6] slightly modifies their argument and shows the following, which we also use to prove Proposition 2.2.

Proposition 2.8. *For all t, let*

$$L_1(t) := \{\mathbf{x_1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1+n_2} \mid \mathbf{x_1} \ge \mathbf{0} \wedge A_1(t)\mathbf{x_1} = \mathbf{b_1}(t)\}.$$

Let r be an integer such that for $t \gg 0$, $\mathbf{x_1}$ in $L_1(t)$, and all i, $0 \le x_i < t^r$. Let

$$L_1'(t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_1} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{r(n_1+n_2)} \mid A_1(t) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} x_{1,j} t^{j-1}, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{r} y_{n_1+n_2,j} t^{j-1} \right) \le \mathbf{b_1}(t) \right\}.$$

Then there exists a finite set $\mathfrak{S}$, a positive integer q, A^1 in $\mathbb{Z}^{q \times r(n_1+n_2)}$, and $\mathbf{b}(\alpha)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[u]^q$ for all α in $\mathfrak{S}$ with the following properties.

For all t, let

$$K(\alpha, t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_1} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{r(n_1+n_2)} \mid A^1 \mathbf{y_1} = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t) \right\}.$$

For $t \gg 0$, the sets $K(\alpha, t)$ for α in $\mathfrak{S}$ are disjoint, and their union is $L_1'(t)$.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Assume Theorem 2.1. Consider the parametric exclusion problem given by $m, n_1, n_2, p_1, p_2, \mathbf{c}, A_1, A_2, \mathbf{b_1}$, and $\mathbf{b_2}$ with optimum value functions $\{f_\ell\}$ and size function g. Let r, N be integers, and construct another parametric exclusion problem, Q', as before. By construction, for all t, $R_2'(t)$ is a subset of $[0, t-1]^{n_2}$. By Proposition 2.8, for $t \gg 0$, L_1' is the disjoint union of $K(\alpha, t)$ for α in $\mathfrak{S}$. Therefore, Theorem 2.1 applies to the new parametric exclusion problem for $t \gg 0$. Being EQP only depends on large arguments, so for all ℓ, f_ℓ' and g' are EQP.

By Proposition 2.7, for $t > N$, $\varphi_{2,t}$ is a bijection from $L_3'(t)$ to $L_3(t)$, so $g'(t) = g(t)$ (for $t > N$.) By construction, this bijection commutes with evaluating the respective objective function, so for all ℓ, $f_\ell'(t) = f_\ell(t)$. Therefore, for all ℓ, f_ℓ and g are EQP, as desired. □

3. Excluding Projections

Consider the setup in Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathbf{y_1} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2}), \mathbf{y_2} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n_2})$, and $\mathbf{y_3} = (y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2})$. In general, we use the same conventions for vectors such as $\mathbf{z_3}$. Let

$$V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) := \{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1} \mid \mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3} \in K(\alpha, t)\}.$$

The number of elements of $K(\alpha, t)$ which project to $\mathbf{y_2}$ equals $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ because $K(\alpha, t)$ is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1+n_2}$.

The main idea for this section is that for all $m' \le m$, t and $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $L_2(t)$, we try to express the proposition $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) < m$ as a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities in $\mathbf{y_2}$. (It turns out that we require extra indeterminates. Later, we skip right to expressing the proposition $\sum_\alpha \#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) < m$ as a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities.) To do this, we try to solve for the other coordinates $\mathbf{y_3} = (y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2})$ according to $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$. *First*, observe that some $\mathbf{y_2}$ are not the projection of *any* real vector in the set

$$\left\{\mathbf{y_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} \mid A^1 \mathbf{y_1} = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)\right\}. \tag{1}$$

Later, we express this property in terms of parametric inequalities. *Second*, for some $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $L_2(t)$ which is the projection of some real vector in (1), we may find that $\mathbf{y_3}$ is not determined uniquely by $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$.

We then restrict some of these coordinates carefully until the rest *are* determined by the equations. We prove that for $t \gg 0$, $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) < m$ if and only if less than m restricted points project to $\mathbf{y_2}$, and if both clauses are true, then the two amounts are equal.

Regarding the first part, for all t, let

$$J(\alpha, t) := \{\mathbf{y_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \mid (\exists \mathbf{y_3} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \mid A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t))\}.$$

If $\mathbf{y_2}$ is not in $J(\alpha, t)$, then $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ is empty. To determine $J(\alpha, t)$, we perform a type of elimination in the variables $\mathbf{y_3} = (y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, y_{n_1+n_2})$ of the matrix A^1, whose entries are integers. There exists an invertible integer matrix D such that DA^1 has the block form

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where B_1 has n_2 columns and q_1 rows (q_1 depends on A^1) and the rows of B_3 are independent.

Since D is invertible, for all t, $K(\alpha, t)$ equals

$$\{y_1 \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1+n_2} \mid DA^1\mathbf{y_1} = D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)\}. \tag{2}$$

Proposition 3.1. *For all t, let $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ be the logical proposition*

$$\bigwedge_{h=1}^{q_1} (((-B_1\mathbf{y_2})_h \leq -(D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_h(t)) \wedge ((B_1\mathbf{y_2})_h \leq (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_h(t))).$$

Then $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $J(\alpha, t)$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$.

Proof. If $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$, then $B_1\mathbf{y_2} = ((D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_1(t), \ldots, (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_{q_1}(t))$.

Since D is invertible, $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$ if and only if $DA^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$, and this holds if and only if

$$B_2\mathbf{y_2} + B_3\mathbf{y_3} = ((D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_{q_1+1}(t), \ldots, (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_q(t)).$$

The rows of $\mathbf{B_3}$ are independent, so there exists a real vector $\mathbf{y_3}$ such that the above equation is true, and $\mathbf{y_2}$ is in $J(\alpha, t)$.

If $\neg\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$, then $B_1\mathbf{y_2} \neq ((D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_1(t), \ldots, (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_{q_1}(t))^\intercal$. For any $\mathbf{y_3}$,

$$DA^1(\mathbf{y_2} + \mathbf{y_3}) = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix}(\mathbf{y_2} + \mathbf{y_3}) = (B_1\mathbf{y_2}) \oplus (B_2\mathbf{y_2} + B_3\mathbf{y_3}) \neq D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t),$$

so $\mathbf{y_2}$ is not in $J(\alpha, t)$. □

Observe that $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ is a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities in $\mathbf{y_2}$. It is possible that $q_1 = 0$ in which case $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ is the empty conjunction, which is always true.

Proposition 3.2. *The negation of a parametric inequality (in integer indeterminates) is a parametric inequality.*

Proof. The negation of $\mathbf{a}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{z} \leq b(t)$, where $\mathbf{z}$ ranges over integer vectors, b is an integer polynomial, and $\mathbf{a}$ is an integer polynomial vector, is the parametric inequality $-\mathbf{a}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{z} \leq -b(t) - 1$. □

For the second part, we recursively define a rooted tree of labeled parametric subsets, or just "subsets", of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1}$. The tree is the same for each α. Each subset in the tree is labelled with a function

$$H : \{n_2 + 1 \ldots, n_2 + n_1\} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_-),$$

and we call this subset $S(H)$. Let $d(H) := \#H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z})$, the number of elements mapped to integers (rather than ordered pairs); this equals with the depth of $S(H)$ in the tree. The maximum depth is $n_1 - q + q_1$.

For all integers k, let $I(k)$ be the polynomial k if $k \geq 0$ and $u + k$ otherwise. For all t, let

$$S(H)(t) := \left\{ \mathbf{y_3} \in \{0, \dots, t-1\}^{n_1} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} (\forall u \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}), y_u = I(H(u))(t)) \wedge \\ (\forall u \notin H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}), H(u)_1 \le y_u \le t + H(u)_2) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{3}$$

$S(H)(t)$ may be empty for some H and t.

The root is labeled with the function H_0 such that$H_0(u) = (0, -1)$ for all ordered pairs u i.e. $S(H)(t)$ is all of $\{0, \dots, t-1\}^{n_1}$.

The children of the node $S(H)$, where $d(H) < n_1 - q + q_1$: For all H, let

$$U(H) := H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_-), \quad U'(H) := H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Since $d(H) < n_1 - q + q_1$, $\#U(H) \ge q - q_1 + 1$. B_3 is an integer matrix with $q - q_1$ rows and columns corresponding to $n_2 + 1, \dots, n_2 + n_1$. Consider the columns corresponding to $U(H)$. They are linearly dependent, so there exists a nonzero integer combination of them which is zero, say $\sum_{u \in U(H)} w_{H,u}(B_3)_{i,u} = 0$ for all i. Set $w_{H,u} = 0$ for u in $U'(H)$. Define $\mathbf{w_H}$ to be the vector given by the $w_{H,u}$. (This $\mathbf{w_H}$ is an arbitrary choice; to make it determinate, one can take the lexicographically first dependent set and the smallest integer combination whose first nonzero coefficient is positive.) We use $\mathbf{w_H}$ later to refer to this vector.

The node $S(H)$ has exactly one child for each choice of u in $U(H)$ and an integer k such that $w_{H,u} \neq 0$ and $0 \le k(w_{H,u})^{-1} < m$, and no other children. The function $H_{u,k}$ for this child is given by

1) $H_{u,k}(u) = H(u)_1 + k$ if $w_{H,u} > 0$ and $H_{u,k}(u) = H(u)_2 - k$ if $w_{H,u} < 0$,

2) For all u' in $U(H)$ such that $u' < u$ and $w_{H,u'} \neq 0$, $H_{u,k}(u') = H(u') + (mw_{H,u'}, 0)$ if $w_{H,u'} > 0$ and $H_{u,k}(u') = H(u') + (0, mw_{H,u'})$ if $w_{H,u'} < 0$,

3) $H_{u,k}(u') = H(u')$ for all u' in $\{n_2 + 1, \dots, n_2 + n_1\}$ not covered by 2) and which are not equal to u.

Observe that $H_{u,k}$ still has the correct form and has 1 higher depth than H, since $H(u)$ is an ordered pair.

Each vertex has finitely many children, and the maximum depth is finite, so this tree is finite.

Proposition 3.3. *Fix t. Given $S(H)$ not of maximal depth, the children of $S(H)$ at t partition the set of $\mathbf{y_3}$ in $S(H)(t)$ such that $\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w}$ is not in $S(H)(t)$, where we refer to the coordinates of $\mathbf{y_3}$ as $y_{n_2+1}, \dots, y_{n_1+n_2}$.*

Proof. It's easy to see that the children of $S(H)$ at t are subsets of $S(H)(t)$.

First suppose that $\mathbf{y_3}$ and $\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H}$ are in $S(H)(t)$. We check, for all u and k such that $w_{H,u} \neq 0$ and $0 \le k < mw_{H,u}$, that $\mathbf{y_3}$ is not in $H_{u,k}$. If so, then $\mathbf{y_3}$ is not in any child of $S(H)$ at t.

If $w_{H,u} > 0$, then by definition, all points in $S(H)(t)$ have u-coordinate at least $H(u)_1$, so $y_u, y_u - mw_{H,u} \ge H(u)_1 \implies y_u \ge mw_{H,u} + H(u)_1$. Then $\mathbf{y_3}$ is not in $H_{u,k}$ for any k with $0 \le k < mw_{H,u}$.

Now consider u such that $w_{H,u} < 0$. $y_u - mw_u \le t + H(u)_2 \implies y_u \le t + H(u)_2 + mw_{H,u}$, and $\mathbf{y_3}$ is not in $H_{u,k}$ for any k with $0 \ge k > mw_{H,u}$, as desired.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathbf{y_3}$ is in $S(H)(t)$ such that $\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H}$ is not in $S(H)(t)$. There exists u with $n_2 + 1 \le u \le n_1 + n_2$ such that $\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H}$ does not satisfy the constraints in (3), so there exists a minimal u. $w_{H,u}$ is not 0 because then $(\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H})_u$ would still satisfy the constraint for u. $H(u)$ is an ordered pair. First suppose that $w_{H,u} > 0$. $H(u)_1 > (\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H})_u = y_u - mw_{H,u} \implies H(u)_1 \le y_u < mw_u + H(u)_1$, which directs us to prove that $\mathbf{y_3}$ lies in $S(H_{u,k})(t)$, where $0 \le k = y_u - H(u)_1 < mw_{H,u}$.

To show this, we need to show that $\mathbf{y_3}$ satisfies the classes of constraints given by 1), 2), and 3) above. 3) is no stronger than those of $S(H)(t)$, so those are satisfied. 1) is true by construction. For 2), consider u' such that $w_{H,u'} \neq 0$ and $u' < u$. $\mathbf{y_3} - m\mathbf{w_H}$ satisfies the constraint corresponding to u', so $H(u')_1 \le y_{u'}, y_{u'} - mw_{H,u'} \le H(u')_2$. It is easy to check that for $w_{H,u'} > 0$ or $w_{u'} < 0$,

$H_{u,k}(u') - 1 \leq y_{u'} \leq H_{u,k}(u')_2$, as desired. The case for $w_{H,u} < 0$ is similar. Therefore, $\mathbf{y_3}$ lies in $S(H_{u,k})(t)$.

To complete the proposition, we show that $\mathbf{y_3}$ as above does not lie in $S(H_{u',k'})$ for any other valid choice of u' and k'. By 1), $\mathbf{y_3}$ does not lie in $S(H_{u,k'})(t)$ for any $k' \neq k$. Since $H(u')_1 \leq y_{u'} - mw_{H,u'} \leq H(u')_2$, $\mathbf{y_3}$ does not lie in $S(H_{u',k'})(t)$ for any u' such that $u' < u$ and $w_{H,u'} \neq 0$.

Suppose that $w_{H,u} > 0$. Then $H(u)_1 \leq y_u < mw_{H,u} + H(u)_1$. For u' such that $u < u'$ and $w_{u'} \neq 0$, $S(H_{u',k'})(t)$ has the constraint from 2) that $H(u)_1 + mw_{H,u} \leq y_u < H(u)_2$, which is not true for $\mathbf{y_3}$, so $\mathbf{y_3}$ does not lie in $S(H_{u',k'})(t)$. The case for $w_{H,u} < 0$ is similar. $S(H_{u',k'})(t)$ only exists when $w_{u'} \neq 0$, so we have covered all cases. $\mathbf{y_3}$ is in $S(H_{u,k})(t)$ and in no other child of $S(H)$ at t. □

Corollary 3.3.1. *For all t, the subsets of maximal depth at t are disjoint.*

One can also check that for any function H of the correct form, there exists N_H such that for all $t > N$, $S(H)(t)$ is nonempty. Then for all t greater than N_H for all H in the tree, of which there are finitely many, all subsets $S(H)(t)$ of maximal depth are nonempty. This shows that the function labels of all of the leaves of the tree are distinct. This allows us to uniquely refer to each subset at maximal by its function label.

Proposition 3.4. *Fix t and $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}$. Assume that less than m elements of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ lie in a subset of maximal depth (at t). Then an element of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ which lies in any subset $S(H)$ of the tree lies in a subset of maximal depth.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the depth d of H backwards, from the maximal depth to 0. The base case, $d = n_1 - q + q_1$, is trivial.

Now suppose that $0 \leq d < n_1 - q + q_1$ and that the proposition is true for deeper subsets. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that $\mathbf{z_3} = (z_{n_2+1}, \ldots, z_{n_1+n_2})$ lies in $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ and $S(H)(t)$ where $d(H) = d$ but not in any subset of maximal depth. The root contains only lattice points, so $\mathbf{z_3}$ is a lattice point. If $\mathbf{z_3}$ lies in a child of $S(H)(t)$, then we get a contradiction using the induction hypothesis.

Therefore, $\mathbf{z_3}$ does not lie in a child of $S(H)(t)$. let $U(H), U'(H)$ and $\mathbf{w_H}$ be as above. By Proposition 3.3, $\mathbf{z_3} + m\mathbf{w_H}$ lies in $S(H)(t)$. It is easy to see that in fact $\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H}$ lies in $S(H)(t)$ for integers m' with $0 \leq m' \leq m$. Consider the sequence of vectors $\{\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H}\}_{m'=0}^{\infty}$. This is a sequence of distinct integer vectors in which the first $m+1$ terms lie in $S(H)(t)$. The sequence eventually leaves $S(H)(t)$ because $\mathbf{w_H}$ is nonzero. Therefore, there exists a positive integer m_0 such that the terms $m_0, m_0+1, \ldots, m_0+m-1$ all lie in $S(H)(t)$ but $m_0 + m$ does not. Since $S(H)(t)$ is a convex set among lattice points, none of the terms after $m_0 + m$ lie in $S(H)(t)$ either. By Proposition 3.3, the vectors $\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H}$ for $m' = m_0, \ldots, m_0 + m - 1$ all lie in a child of $S(H)$, and they are all distinct. Since a child of $S(H)(t)$ has greater depth, by the induction hypothesis, all of these vectors lie in a subset of maximal depth.

On the other hand, $\mathbf{z_3}$ lies in $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$, so $\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{z_3}$ lies in $K(\alpha, t)$. By (2),

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{z_3}) = D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t).$$

Here, $\mathbf{y_2}$ coincides with the first columns of blocks, and $\mathbf{z_3}$ coincides with the second. By the construction of $\mathbf{w_H}$, $B_3\mathbf{w_H} = 0$, so for all m',

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus (\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H})) = D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t).$$

For $m' = m_0, \ldots, m_0 + m - 1$, $\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H}$ is in $S(H)(t)$, which is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1}$, so $\mathbf{y_2} \oplus (\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H})$ is in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1+n_2}$. By (2), $\mathbf{z_3} + m'\mathbf{w_H}$ is in $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$. This is a contradiction

because we assumed that less than m different vectors are in $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ lie in a subset of maximal depth. Therefore, an element of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ which lies in a subset of the tree lies in a subset of maximal depth. □

Corollary 3.4.1. *Fix t. For all $\mathbf{y_2}$ and integers m^* with $0 \leq m^* < m$, $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) = m^*$ if and only if exactly m^* distinct elements of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ lie in a subset of maximal depth.*

Proof. Since the root of the tree is $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}^{n_1}$, the backwards direction is simply the above proposition. For the forwards direction, at most $m^* < m$ elements of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ lie in a subset of maximal depth, so the above proposition shows that all elements of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ lie in a subset of maximal depth. □

Proposition 3.5. *For any subset of the tree, $S(H)$, the columns of B_3 corresponding to $U(H) = H^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_-)$ form a rank $q - q_1$ (full rank) matrix.*

Proof. We use induction based on the depth, increasing. Since the rows of B_3 are independent, this is true for depth 0.

Suppose that $S(H_{u,k})$ is a child of $S(H)$ and that the proposition is true for H. Let B_H be the matrix of columns of B_3 which correspond to $U(H)$ in order and no other columns. Then B_H has full rank. By construction, $U(H_{u,k}) = U(H) \setminus \{u\}$. The u^{th} column of B_3 is dependent on the other columns corresponding to $U(H)$, and all of these columns appear in B_H, and so the removing the corresponding column in B_H leaves a full rank matrix, as desired. □

Fix $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $J(\alpha, t)$, and H of maximal depth. The idea is that by Proposition 3.5, there exists a vector of rational polynomials, $\mathbf{Y_3}(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H) = (Y(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_{n_2+1}, \ldots, Y(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_{n_1+n_2})$, which we simply call $\mathbf{Y_3} = (Y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, Y_{n_1+n_2})$ for now, such that

1) for all u in $U'(H)$, $Y_u(t) = I(H(u))(t)$ and 2) the unique vector $\mathbf{y_3}$ such that $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$, is given by $\mathbf{y_3} = \mathbf{Y_3}(t)$.

Let $\mathbf{Z_3} = (Z_{n_2+1}, \ldots, Z_{n_1+n_2})$ be an auxiliary polynomial vector. For all u in $U'(H)$, let Y_u and Z_u be the polynomial $I(H(u))$. For u in $U(H)$ (all other u in $\{n_2+1, \ldots, n_1+n_2\}$), let Z_u be 0.

Let $U(H)$, sorted ascending, be $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{|U(H)|}\}$, where $|U(H)| = q - q_1$. Define B_H as in Proposition 3.5; it is an invertible matrix of integers.With our notation $v_1, \ldots, v_{|U(H)|}$, we can also write B_H as

$$\{(B_3)_{q_1+i, v_j}\}_{i=1,j=1}^{q-q_1, q-q_1}.$$

For h from 1 to $q - q_1$, let Y_{v_h} be the polynomial

$$\left(B_H^{-1}\left(\left((D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_{q_1+1}, \ldots, (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_q\right) - B_2\mathbf{y_2} - B_3\mathbf{Z_3}\right)\right)_h. \tag{4}$$

Proposition 3.6. *For all t, α in $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $J(\alpha, t)$, and H of maximal depth, the unique real vector $\mathbf{y_3}$ such that $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$, and for all u in $U'(H)$, $y_u = I(H(u))(t)$, is given by $\mathbf{y_3} = \mathbf{Y_3}(t)$.*

Proof. We first check that $\mathbf{y_3} = \mathbf{Y_3}(t)$ satisfies the equation. Since D is invertible, it suffices to check

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{Y_3}(t)) = D\mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t).$$

By Proposition 3.1, the first q_1 coordinates match. It's easy to see that the equation in the other $q - q_1$ coordinates is given by

$$B_2\mathbf{y_2} + B_3\mathbf{Z_3}(t) + B_H\left(Y_{v_1}(y), \ldots, Y_{v_{|U(h)|}}(t)\right) = \left((D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_{q_1+1}(t), \ldots, (D\mathbf{b}(\alpha))_q(t)\right),$$

and this is true by construction.

We now check that this is unique. If not, we see, by subtraction, that there exists a nonzero vector $\mathbf{y'_3} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ such that for all u in $U'(H)$, $y'_u = 0$, and

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ B_2 & B_3 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{y'_3}) = 0.$$

This contradicts the fact that B_H is invertible, so indeed $\mathbf{Y_3}(t)$ is the unique vector. □

Proposition 3.7. *Given t, α in $\mathfrak{S}$, $\mathbf{y_2}$ in $J(\alpha, t)$, and H of maximal depth, define $\mathbf{Y_3}$ as above. Let*

$$\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H) := \left(\bigwedge_{u=n_2+1}^{n_1+n_2} 0 \le Y_u \le t-1 \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{u \in U(H)} (H(u)_1 \le Y_u(t) \le t + H(u)_2 \wedge Y_u(t) \in \mathbb{Z}) \right)$$

Then $S(H)(t)$ contains exactly one point of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ if $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$ and zero points otherwise.

Proof. By definition, for all $\mathbf{y_3}$ in $S(H)(t)$ and u in $U'(H)$, $y_u = I(H(u))(t)$. Proposition 3.6 tells us the unique real vector $\mathbf{y_3}$ with these coordinates which satisfies $A^1(\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) = \mathbf{b}(\alpha)(t)$, so if this vector lies in $S(H)(t)$ (which is a subset of $\{0, \dots, t-1\}^{n_1}$), then $S(H)(t)$ contains exactly one point of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ and zero otherwise. We automatically have, for u in $U'(H)$, that $y_u \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$ is equivalent to the proposition that $\mathbf{Y_3}(t)$ is in $S(H)(t)$. □

This proposition is not a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities, but we can form an auxiliary PILP in which an equivalent proposition *is* a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities. This auxiliary PILP will have many more indeterminates.

By the definition of $\mathbf{Y_3}(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$, specifically (4), each of its coordinates is a rational polynomial covector times $\mathbf{y_2}$ plus a rational polynomial. Therefore, the whole vector has a common denominator. Since there are finitely many α and H, there exists a common denominator to all vectors $\mathbf{Y_3}(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$, say T, which we take to be positive.

3.1. **The auxiliary parametric integer linear program.** We now form a PILP, Q^*, which is not in form shown in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. Instead, its feasible set is defined by a disjunction of conjunctions of parametric inequalities rather than a conjunction. We refer to the data described in Theorem 2.1. The indeterminates are $\mathbf{y_2} = (y_1, \dots, y_{n_2})$ and $Y_{\alpha,H,u,i}$ for all α in $\mathfrak{S}$, H of maximal depth, u in $U(H)$, and $i = 1$ or 2 (so there are finitely many indeterminates). Let $\mathbf{y}$ be a vector of all of the indeterminates; the order is not important. The objective function is $\mathbf{c}^\intercal(t)\mathbf{y_2}$, which can be written as a polynomial covector times $\mathbf{y}$.

Some of the constraints of Q^* are $A_2(t)\mathbf{y_2} \le \mathbf{b_2}(t)$, which are the constraints of $L_2(t)$, $0 \le Y_{\alpha,H,u,2} \le T-1$ and

$$TY(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t) = Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}T + Y_{\alpha,H,u,1},$$

where T is the common denominator from the end of the previous subsection. These can be written as parametric inequalities. Note that by assumption, these constraints imply $0 \le y_1, \dots, y_{n_2} \le t-1$. Let its lattice point set be $L^*(t)$. It is easy to see that for all t, no two points in $L(t)$ have the same value of $\mathbf{y_2}$. Define $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ as before; it is a finite logical combination of parametric inequalities in $\mathbf{y_2}$. Define $\mathbb{P}'(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$ (similarly to $\mathbb{P}'(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$) to be

$$\left(\bigwedge_{u=n_2+1}^{n_1+n_2} 0 \le Y_u \le t-1 \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{q-q_1} (H(v_i)_1 \le Y_{v_i}(t) \le t + H(v_i)_2 \wedge Y_{\alpha,H,u,1} = 0) \right),$$

where $\mathbf{Y_3}(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H) = (Y_{n_2+1}, \ldots, Y_{n_1+n_2})$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set of all H of maximal depth. The last constraint is

$$\bigvee_{W_1 \subset \mathfrak{S}} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S} \setminus W_1} \neg \mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) \right) \wedge \left(\bigvee_{\substack{W_2 \subset W_1 \times \mathcal{H} \\ |W_1||\mathcal{H}| - |W_2| < m}} \bigwedge_{(\alpha, H) \in W_2} \neg \mathbb{P}'(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H) \right) \right). \tag{5}$$

Observe that this is a finite combination of parametric inequalities. Let Q^* have optimum value functions $\{f_\ell^*\}$ and size function g^*. To determine these, the indeterminates are constrained to be integers, as usual.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $R^*(t)$ be the real vector set. Then for all t, $R^*(t)$ is bounded.*

Proof. Fix t. Then $R_2(t)$ is bounded, so $R^*(t)$ is bounded in the coordinates $\mathbf{y_2} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{n_2})$, say by N in each coordinate. $R^*(t)$ is bounded in the coordinates $Y_{\alpha,H,u,2}$. For $\mathbf{y}$ in $R^*(t)$, $|Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}| \leq |Y(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t)| + 1$. We have $|y_i| < N$, and $Y(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t)$ equals a real covector times $\mathbf{y_2}$, so $R^*(t)$ is bounded in the coordinates $Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}$, as desired. □

Proposition 3.9. *Fix t. A vector $\mathbf{y_2}$ is the projection of one element of $L(t)$ if it lies in $L_3(t)$, and $\mathbf{y_2}$ is the projection of zero elements of $L(t)$ otherwise.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{y_2}$ is the projection of one element of $L^*(t)$. Then $\mathbf{y_2}$ lies in $L_2(t)$. From (5), there exists a subset W_1 of $\mathfrak{S}$ and a subset W_2 of $W_1 \times \mathcal{H}$ that excludes less than m elements such that

$$\left(\bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S} \setminus W_1} \neg \mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{(\alpha, H) \in W_2} \neg \mathbb{P}'(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H) \right).$$

By Proposition 3.1, for all α in $\mathfrak{S} \setminus W_1$, $\mathbf{y_2}$ is not in $J(\alpha, t)$, and $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) = 0$.

There is a unique integer vector $\mathbf{y}$ that projects onto $\mathbf{y_2}$ such that the constraints

$$0 \leq Y_{\alpha,H,u,2} \leq T - 1 \text{ and } TY(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t) = Y_{\alpha,H,u,1} T + Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}$$

are satisfied. $\mathbf{y_2}$ is the projection of one element of $L^*(t)$, so $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the other constraints of Q^*.

It's easy to check that the proposition $Y_{\alpha,H,u,1} = 0$, which is implicitly a proposition of $\mathbf{y_2}$, is equivalent to the proposition $Y(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathbb{P}'(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$. By Proposition 3.7, $\neg \mathbb{P}(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}, H)$ implies that $S(H)(t)$ contains zero points of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$. For all (α, H) in $W_1 \times \mathcal{H}$ except at most $m - 1$, $S(H)(t)$ contains zero points of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$.

Therefore, for all α in W_1, the number of distinct elements of $V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$ that lie in a subset of maximal depth is less than m. By Corollary 3.4.1, this number equals $\#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2})$. The sets $K(\alpha, t)$ for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}$ are disjoint, so

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in \sqcup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}} K(\alpha, t)\} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}} \#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0, \ldots, t-1\} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in K(\alpha, t)\} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}, H \in \mathcal{H}} \#V(\alpha, t, \mathbf{y_2}) \cap S(H)(t) \leq m - 1, \end{aligned}$$

so $\mathbf{y_2}$ lies in $L_3(t)$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathbf{y_2}$ lies in $L_3(t)$. There is a unique integer vector $\mathbf{y}$ that projects onto $\mathbf{y_2}$ such that the constraints $0 \leq Y_{\alpha,H,u,2} \leq T - 1$ and

$$TY(\alpha, \mathbf{y_2}, H)_u(t) = Y_{\alpha,H,u,1} T + Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}$$

are satisfied. $\mathbf{y_2}$ is the projection of one element of $L^*(t)$ if $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the other constraints of Q.

The set $L_3(t)$ is a subset of $L_2(t)$, so $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the constraints $A_2(t)\mathbf{y_2} \leq \mathbf{b_2}(t)$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} m &> \#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0,\dots,t-1\} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in \sqcup_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{S}} K(\alpha,t)\} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{S}} \#\{\mathbf{y_3} \in \{0,\dots,t-1\} \mid (\mathbf{y_2} \oplus \mathbf{y_3}) \in K(\alpha,t)\} \\ &\geq \sum_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{S}, H\in\mathcal{H}} \#V(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2}) \cap S(H)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &:= \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{S} \mid \mathbb{P}(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2})\}, \\ W_2 &:= \{(\alpha,H) \in W_1 \times \mathcal{H} \mid V(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2}) \cap S(H)(t) = \varnothing\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the sets $V(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2}) \cap S(H)(t)$ have size at most 1, $|W_1||\mathcal{H}| - |W_2| < m$. By Proposition 3.7, for $(\alpha,H) \in W_2$, $\neg\mathbb{P}(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2},H)$ holds. As before, $\mathbb{P}(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2},H)$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}'(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2},H)$. Altogether, we have

$$\left(\bigwedge_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{S}\setminus W_1} \neg\mathbb{P}(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2})\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{(\alpha,H)\in W_2} \neg\mathbb{P}'(\alpha,t,\mathbf{y_2},H)\right),$$

which implies (5) and that $\mathbf{y}$ lies in $L^*(t)$. □

Corollary 3.9.1. *For all t and ℓ, $g(t) = g^*(t)$ and $f_\ell(t) = f^*_\ell(t)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.9, the map φ_t that takes a vector $\mathbf{y}$ to $\mathbf{y_2}$ by ignoring the other coordinates is a bijection from $L^*(t)$ to $L_3(t)$. By construction, this bijection commutes with evaluating the respective objective function, so we're done. □

4. Untangling Disjunctions and Conjunctions

Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 only apply to PILPs given by a finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities;they do not trivially apply to Q^*. In this section, we extend these theorems to PILPs such as Q^* (which are not in canonical form). Recall that the full constraints of Q^* are

$$A_2(t)\mathbf{y_2} \leq \mathbf{b_2}(t) \wedge \left(\bigwedge 0 \leq Y_{\alpha,H,u,2} \leq T-1\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge TY(\alpha,\mathbf{y_2},H)_u(t) = Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}T + Y_{\alpha,H,u,1}\right) \wedge (5).$$

The negation of a parametric inequality over integer indeterminates is another parametric inequality. Using this fact, De Morgan's laws and the logical distributive laws, one finds that the constraints of Q^* are a finite disjunction of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities of $\mathbf{y}$.

It remains to extend theorems 1.6 and 1.7 to PILPs given by a finite disjunction of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities whose real vector set is bounded for all t.

Proposition 4.1. *For a PILP whose lattice point set is given by a finite disjunction of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities whose real vector set is bounded for all t, all optimum value functions and the size value function are EQP.*

Proof. First, we rewrite a finite disjunction of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities as a finite "disjoint disjunction" of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities; that is, the component conjunctional clauses define parametric regions which are disjoint for any fixed t. We generalize the following identity:

$$(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D) = (A \wedge B) \oplus (A \wedge \neg B \wedge C \wedge D) \oplus (\neg A \wedge C \wedge D).$$

Here, $\oplus$ denotes disjunction and simultaneously states that no two of the following propositions can be true at the same time. This is *not* exclusive disjunction; it is analogous to a disjoint union of

sets. Let T be a finite set of finite sets of propositions and suppose that all sets are totally ordered by $<$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigvee_{S\in T}\bigwedge_{a\in S} a &= \bigoplus_{S\in T}\left(\left(\bigwedge_{a\in S} a\right)\wedge \bigwedge_{R\in T,R<S}\neg\left(\bigwedge_{a\in R} a\right)\right)\\
&= \bigoplus_{S\in T}\left(\left(\bigwedge_{a\in S} a\right)\wedge \bigwedge_{R\in T,R<S}\bigoplus_{a\in R}\left(a\wedge \bigwedge_{b\in R,b<a}\neg b\right)\right)\\
&= \bigoplus_{S\in T}\left(\left(\bigwedge_{a\in S} a\right)\wedge \bigoplus_{(a_R\in R)\forall R\in T,R<S}\bigwedge_{R\in T,R<S}\left(a_R\wedge \bigwedge_{b\in R,b<a_R}\neg b\right)\right)\\
&= \bigoplus_{\substack{S\in T\\(a_R\in R)\forall R\in T,R<S}}\left(\left(\bigwedge_{a\in S} a\right)\wedge \bigwedge_{R\in T,R<S}\left(a_R\wedge \bigwedge_{b\in R,b<a_R}\neg b\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the last line is a finite disjoint disjunction of finite conjunctions of propositions. Now consider a PILP whose constraints are equivalent to a finite disjunction of finite conjunctions of parametric inequalities. Let T be the set that represents these constraints. By the above equations, the lattice point set (or real vector set) equals the disjoint union of the lattice point sets (or real vector sets) for the PILPs determined by the component conjunctions. If the real vector set defined by $\vee_{S\in T}\wedge_{a\in S} a$ is bounded for all t, the same must be true for the component conjunctional clauses in the last line. Therefore, Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 apply directly to each component.

Now, we extend Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 to finite disjoint disjunctions. It is easy to see that Theorem 1.6 extends to finite disjoint disjunctions because the size functions add, and a finite sum of EQPs is EQP.

To extend Theorem 1.7, observe that for all t and ℓ, the ℓ^{th} largest value of the objective function in the disjoint union equals the ℓ^{th} largest value in the union of the multisets of the ℓ largest values from each component (at t). If a component's lattice point set has size less than ℓ, our convention is that the multiset of the ℓ largest values contains $-\infty$ at least once. There are finitely many components. By Proposition 3.4 of [6], the ℓ^{th} optimum value function is EQP. □

This proposition applies directly to Q^* and completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.5

Roune and Woods showed that, to prove their conjecture, it sufficed to consider certain n-tuples of polynomials. We present the same results for our more general theorem.

Proposition 5.1. *To prove Theorem 1.5, it suffices to consider polynomials $Q_1,\ldots,Q_n$ that map $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and have positive leading coefficients such that for $t\gg 0$, $\gcd(Q_1(t),\ldots,Q_n(t))=1$.*

Proof. Let $P_1,\ldots,P_n$ be as in Theorem 1.5. Lemma 3.4 of Roune and Woods[5] shows that $h(t):=\gcd(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t))$ is EQP. Each P_i is eventually positive, so in fact h is eventually positive. By Lemma 3.3 of their paper, for $i=1,\ldots,n$, $\frac{P_i(t)}{h(t)}$ is EQP. It is also integer valued and positive. Suppose that d is a common period of h and all polynomials P_i/h, and let a be an integer. For $i=1,\ldots,n$, let $P_{i,a}(s):=\frac{P_i(a+sd)}{h(a+sd)}$.

For all i, d is a period of P_i/h, so $P_{i,a}$ eventually agrees with a polynomial. Furthermore, $P_{i,a}$ is eventually positive and maps $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$, and for $s\gg 0$, $\gcd(P_{1,a}(s),\ldots,P_{n,a}(s))=1$.

Suppose that Theorem 1.5 is true for polynomials $Q_1, \ldots, Q_n$ such that for sufficiently large t, $\gcd(Q_1(t), \ldots, Q_n(t)) = 1$. Since we only care about large s, this theorem applies to $P_{1,a}, \ldots, P_{n,a}$, so $F_{m,\ell}(P_{1,a}(s), \ldots, P_{n,a}(s))$ as a function of s is EQP. When $t \equiv a \pmod{d}$, $\frac{t-a}{d}$ is an integer, and

$$F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) = h(t) F_{m,\ell}\left(\frac{P_1(t)}{h(t)}, \ldots, \frac{P_n(t)}{h(t)}\right)$$
$$= h(t) F_{m,\ell}\left(P_{1,a}\left(\frac{t-a}{d}\right), \ldots, P_{n,a}\left(\frac{t-a}{d}\right)\right).$$

Since h and $F_{m,\ell}(P_{1,a}(s), \ldots, P_{n,a}(s))$ are EQP, $F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ with t restricted to $a \pmod{d}$ is EQP. It easily follows that $F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ is EQP. A similar argument proves the proposition for G_m.

□

Proposition 5.2. *To prove Theorem 1.5, it suffices to consider $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ in $\mathbb{Z}[u]$ such that for $t \gg 0$, $\gcd(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) = 1$.*

Proof. Given Proposition 5.1, this proposition is merely Lemma 3.1 and Remark 3.2 of Roune and Woods[5]. □

We require a simple bound on the Frobenius number, which corresponds to the second region of a parametric exclusion problem.

Theorem 5.3 (Erdős and Graham[2])**.** *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be positive integers such that $x_1 < x_2 \cdots < x_n$ and $\gcd(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1$. Then $F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leq 2x_n \left\lfloor \frac{x_1}{n} \right\rfloor - x_1$.*

It is simpler to prove the weaker result $F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) < x_n^2$.

Corollary 5.3.1. *Let n, m, and ℓ be positive integers with $n \geq 2$ and $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ be in $\mathbb{Z}[u]$ and eventually positive. Then for some integer r all $t \gg 0$, $\ell + F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) < t^r$.*

Proof. This follows easily from the proof of Proposition 1.2, which shows that $h(k) > m$ for $k > ma_1a_2 + F(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By propositions 5.1 and 5.2, it suffices to consider the following type of parametric Frobenius problem. Let n, m, and ℓ be positive integers such that $n \geq 2$. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ be polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[u]$ with positive leading coefficient such that for sufficiently large t, $\gcd(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) = 1$. Then there exists r as in the above corollary.

We now formulate a parametric exclusion problem as in theorem 1.8. Let $n_1 = n, n_2 = 1, m = m$, and the indeterminates be $k, b_1, \ldots, b_n$. Let

$$R_1(t) = [0, t^r - 1], \quad R_2(t) = \left\{(k, b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in [0, t^r - 1]^{n+1} \mid k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} i b_i P_i(t) = \ell\right\}.$$

It is easy to see how to form $A_1, A_2, \mathbf{b_1}, \mathbf{b_2}$ such that R_1 and R_2 match the hypotheses in Theorem 1.5. These sets are bounded for all t. Let $L_1(t), L_2(t)$, and $L_3(t)$ be as in the hypotheses. Let $\mathbf{c} = (1)$. Let $\{f_\ell\}$ be the optimum value functions and g be the size function. By Theorem 1.8, f_ℓ and g are EQP for all ℓ.

For $t \gg 0$, $\ell + F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) < t^r$ and $P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t) > 1$. Since $\gcd(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) = 1$, we also have $\ell + F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) \geq 0$. For $t \gg 0$, $L_3(t)$ is the set of all nonnegative integers k such that $k - \ell$ is a nonnegative integer combination of $P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)$ in less than m ways, since such k must be less than t^r, and a coefficient in any nonnegative integer combination cannot exceed k. Therefore,

$$F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t), \ldots, P_n(t)) = -\ell + f_\ell(t).$$

Since the EQP property only depends on large arguments, $F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t))$ is an EQP function of t. For $t \gg 0$, $g(t)$ counts all integers at least $-\ell$ which are nonnegative integer combinations in less than m ways, and all of the integers $-\ell,\ldots,-1$ are counted. However, $G_m(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t))$ counts only the positive integers. Therefore,

$$G_m(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t)) = -\ell + g(t),$$

from which it follows that $G_m(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t))$ is an EQP function of t, as before. □

Remark. Theorems 1.5 and 1.8 are not true if constants m and ℓ are replaced by polynomials of t such as t itself. For example, $F_{1,t}(t,t-1)$, $F_{t,1}(6,10,15)$, and $G_t(6,10,15)$ are not eventually quasi-polynomial. We omit the proofs of these statements.

6. Future directions

Our work does not address how the components of the resulting eventual quasi-polynomials are related. For example, the components of $F_{m,\ell}(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t))$ are likely to have the same degree fairly often, but from our argument, it is very hard to tell when. Our methods do not offer reasonable bounds on the period of the eventual quasi-polynomials or an algorithmically feasible way of computing them. For these reasons, it may be of interest to refine our argument.

A parametric problem closely related to the parametric Frobenius problem is the identification of a reduced Gröbner basis of an associated ideal. See [4]. The reduced Gröbner basis is not unique, so we define a particular one here and also rewrite the ideas without referring to commutative algebra. For positive integers $a_1,\ldots,a_n$, let

$$S := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{v}\cdot(a_1,\ldots,a_n) = 0\}.$$

For real n-dimensional vectors, write $\prec$ for lexicographically less than, etc. and $<$ for less than in all coordinates, etc. For $\mathbf{v}$ (in $\mathbb{R}^n$,) such that $\mathbf{v} \prec 0$, we define the positive part of $\mathbf{v}$, $\mathbf{v}^+$, such that $\mathbf{v}_i^+ = \max(v_i, 0)$, and we define $\mathbf{v}^-$ to be $\mathbf{v}^+ - \mathbf{v}$. Let

$$G(S) := \{\mathbf{v} \in S \mid \mathbf{v} \prec 0 \wedge \forall \mathbf{u} \in S, (\mathbf{u} \prec 0 \wedge \mathbf{u}^+ \leq \mathbf{v}^+) \implies (\mathbf{u}^+ = \mathbf{v}^+ \wedge \mathbf{v}^- \preceq \mathbf{u}^-)\}.$$

In other words, $G(S)$ is the set of the elements of S which are lexicographically less than 0 whose positive parts do not strictly dominate ($\geq$ in all coordinates and $>$ in at least one) the positive part of any other such element of S and whose negative part is the lexicographically minimum possible for that positive part. It is not hard to show that $G(S)$ is finite for each finite set of positive integers. As before, we let $P_1,\ldots,P_n$ be in $\mathbb{R}[u]$ which take $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and are eventually positive. For sufficiently large t, let $S(t)$ be

$$\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{v}\cdot(P_1(t),\ldots,P_n(t)) = 0\},$$

and let $G(S(t))$ be as above.

Conjecture 6.1. *There exists a PILP given by a finite disjunction of finite conjunction of parametric inequalities whose lattice point set equals $G(S(t))$ for $t \gg 0$. The same is true for $\{\mathbf{v}^+ \mid \mathbf{v} \in G(S(t))\}$.*

Remark. G(S)(t) may not be of bounded size. One can show that when $n = 4$, $P_1(t) = 2t^2+4t, P_2(t) = 2t^2 - t + 1, P_3(t) = 4t^2 + 2t - 1, P_4(t) = 4t^2 - 3t$, for $t \gg 0$,

$$G(S(t)) = \{(-1,1,1,-1),(-2t+2,-1,t-1,2),\ldots\langle+1,-1,-1,+1\rangle\ldots,(-t+1,-t,0,t+1),$$

$$(0,-2t,t,-1),(-2t+1,2t,0,2)\ldots\langle+1,-1,-1,+1\rangle\ldots(-t-1,t+2,-t+2,t),(-1,2t+1,-t+1,0)\}.$$

The original motivation for formulating this conjecture was propositions 4 and 5 of Roune's [4], which showed that the Frobenius number, as a function of t, is the maximum of a fixed polynomial covector times $\mathbf{v}$ for $\mathbf{v}$ in some set related to $G(S(t))$. If $G(S(t))$ can be understood, then Theorem 1.7 can be applied. We ended up using a more direct approach to decompose the parametric Frobenius problem.

Our work shows that the parametric Frobenius problem can be well understood by transforming it into a parametric integer linear program. This idea may be useful in studying other parametric combinatorics problems such as those in [8] whose answers are suspected to be eventually polynomial.

7. Acknowledgements

The author thanks Joe Gallian for suggesting the problem and for helpful comments on the manuscript. This research was conducted at the University of Minnesota Duluth REU and was supported by NSF grant 1358695 and NSA grant H98230-13-1-0273.

References

[1] Sheng Chen, Nan Li, and Steven V. Sam. Generalized Ehrhart polynomials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364(1):551-569, 2012.
[2] Paul Erdős and Ron Graham. On a linear diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Acta Arith.* 21(1),399-408.
[3] J. L. Ramírez Alfonsín. *The diophantine Frobenius problem,Oxford Lecture Ser. Math. Appl.* 30. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
[4] Bjarke Roune. Solving thousand digit Frobenius problems using Gröbner bases. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 43 (1),1–7.
[5] Bjarke Roune and Kevin Woods. The parametric Frobenius problem. *Electron. J. Combin.* 22(2015), #P2.36.
[6] Bobby Shen. Parametrizing an integer linear program by an integer. Preprint, arXiv:1510.01343 [math.CO]
[7] James J. Sylvester. Mathematical questions with their solutions. *Educational Times*, 41(21), 1884.
[8] Kevin Woods. The unreasonable ubiquitousness of quasi-polynomials. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 21(1):#P1.44, 2014.